

Reviewing Stand

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

Is World Trade the Pathway to World Peace?

A radio discussion over WGN and the Mutual Broadcasting System
in cooperation with the First United States International Trade Fair

RABBI LOUIS BINSTOCK

Temple Sholom, Chicago

MAXWELL FISHER

British Economist; Member, European Trade Fair Board of the Organization for European
Economic Cooperation

JACQUES KUNSTENAAR

Director of Foreign Affairs, First United States International Trade Fair

GEORGE C. ROBINSON

Professor of Government, Iowa State Teachers College
Visiting Professor, Northwestern University

Moderator: LEIGHTON BORIN

Director, The Reviewing Stand

Broadcast continuously since 1934 by Northwestern University



THE REVIEWING STAND is a weekly radio forum presented by Northwestern University. The program was first broadcast by Station WGN, Chicago, October 14, 1934. It has been on the air continuously since that time, originating in the WGN studios, and, since 1935, carried by the stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System. THE REVIEWING STAND presents members of the Northwestern University faculty and distinguished guests from business, government, education, and the press in round table discussions of contemporary problems—the questions that are in the news. The program is under the direction of James H. McBurney, Dean of the School of Speech, Northwestern University; Miss Myrtle Stahl, Director of Educational Programs, WGN, Chicago.

The Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, published weekly beginning May 2, 1943, by the Offices of the Director of Radio (Public Relations), Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Evanston, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1875. Subscription price, \$1.00 for 16 weeks, \$2.00 for 32 weeks, \$2.50 for one year. Single copies, ten cents.

Is World Trade the Pathway to World Peace?

MR. BORIN: War in Korea makes us look in two different directions: Into the future to ask, "Did we see the beginning of World War III at the 38th parallel? Will we win in Korea, and . . . What will be Russia's next move?" Into the past to ask, "What might have been done to avert the Korean crisis?"

In an analysis of this last question, the economic relations between nations loom as significant—foreign investment, foreign aid, and world trade. Today, in cooperation with the First United States International Trade Fair, we present four men who will consider world trade and its relation to world peace.

Mr. Kunstenhaar, in looking at our question, "Is World Trade the Pathway to World Peace?" we see two important phrases—"world trade" and "world peace." Take the first of these. What do we include when we talk about "world trade"?

'Physical Interchange'

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I think we can define world trade as the physical interchange of goods between nations. MR. BORIN: Do the rest of you gentlemen agree on that definition?

RABBI BINSTOCK: Yes, we would agree. MR. BORIN: Let us move on, then, and consider the next very important phrase, "world peace." Rabbi Binstock, what do we mean by world peace?

RABBI BINSTOCK: I should say that world peace means essentially the absence of a shooting war and a violent attack upon the life of nations.

MR. BORIN: Let's be quite specific now. Do we have world peace today with the crisis in Korea and all?

RABBI BINSTOCK: I should say we do not have world peace because there is a shooting war.

MR. BORIN: Then you consider world peace to mean a condition in which

we do not have a shooting war. Is that true?

RABBI BINSTOCK: Exactly.

MR. BORIN: All right. Now back to our first question: Is world trade the pathway to world peace? Mr. Fisher, how would you as a Britisher answer that puzzler?

'A Pathway'

MR. FISHER: Is world trade the pathway for world peace? That is a very difficult question. But I would like, however, to start by saying that in my opinion it is not *the* pathway for world peace but rather *a* pathway—and a very important one.

I have heard it argued throughout the world that, should every country break down its protective trade barriers and allow free trade, this would immediately set off a firecracker of mad competition, resulting in an economic warfare which in turn would ultimately lead to a shooting war. I cannot believe this argument would in any way be substantially true should this world state of Utopia even be achieved. There is even now, in spite of the somewhat archaic customs and tariff regulations, the fiercest competition among the countries of Europe for the American market. However, it does not appear to be remotely likely that this competition will precipitate a war. Healthy competition in trade or in anything else can only help to stimulate individual enterprise. One doesn't have to kill the other fellow in the process. Even here in your United States, there is tremendous competition between the states for trade, but there is no evidence of a recurrence of the events of 1861—not even by Texas!

I have noticed wherever I have been that individuals in the countries of this world who have not travelled nor met people of countries other than their own are the ones most likely to

have antipathy towards foreigners. Quite obviously everyone in this world cannot travel. However, world trade could, to a large extent, be a medium to promote better understanding. An instance of this is the very fact that France and Great Britain have not been at war since they signed what was tantamount to a trade agreement, and that was a long time ago. In Germany, for instance, between the eastern and western zones trade has been virtually at a standstill since the war. The same has been true between North and South Korea. If these people would allow their satellites to trade freely with the world, instead of cooping them up and disseminating their insidious propaganda against the western civilization — propaganda which can only propagate and breed a desire for mistrust and calumny—our fellow travelers would have been vastly different people.

'Slings and Arrows'

Yes, I think world trade is a pathway to world peace. However, it is a pathway which has suffered the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune in the shape of customs, tariffs, and individual interference. I say individual interference because in coming into this magnificent building just now I saw a painting of a man, and printed below were these words, "Matthew Lyon imprisoned for criticism of Government." And underneath that was written, "In a loathsome prison almost deprived of the right of reason."

MR. BORIN: Mr. Kunstenaar, do you agree with Mr. Fisher?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I agree with every word he said. I assume when we ask the question, Is world trade the pathway to world peace? we mean by world trade the maintenance of a substantial flow of goods across frontiers or, even better, an increase from the present level of international exchange. If this is correct, I will certainly state that world trade is one of the most important pathways to world peace, though I am fully aware that it is not the only one. I will even

go further and say that an increase in world trade must be accompanied by many other measures of a political and moral nature in order to be successful. But I cannot visualize world peace without a high level of world trade.

While our own high standard of living would be sensibly affected by a reduction of the trade volume we carry on with the rest of the world, it would cause the living conditions of the peoples of many foreign countries, who are even more dependent on international trade than we are, to drop to a dangerously low level—dangerous because people who are insufficiently fed and clothed and who are denied even the small luxuries of life become desperate and an easy prey to foreign political ideologies. That is the reason why certain countries strenuously opposed Marshall Plan aid which strengthened the nations friendly to us by allowing them to build up the production machinery and to buy from us the goods they vitally need. Communism was thus stemmed and peace got a better chance than in a world with a majority of the nations hostile to us.

'Traditional Policy'

By aiming at an increase in world trade, our Government is simply following its traditional policy of maintaining the peace. By bringing together buyers, goods and manufacturers from over 40 nations the First United States International Trade Fair to be held in Chicago from August 7 to 20th is contributing its modest share to the cause of world trade and world peace.

RABBI BINSTOCK: I should like to start with the proposition that it is not good for a nation, any more than it is for man, to live alone.

Trade, even travel, opens the doors of knowledge and understanding to peoples' ways of living and wishes for life. Trade makes for intercourse between nations and the interchange of ideas as well as goods. The more that peoples get together to trade as well as to talk, the chances are the

happier they will be. It is because world trade breaks through the Iron Curtains of isolation and ignorance, of conceit and complacency, that it fashions one of the soundest and surest pathways to world peace. Its purposes are so necessary and valuable that they far outweigh its perils.

The results that it can achieve more than balance its risks. World trade always helps in the development of nations' respect for each other, in cooperation between nations, and also enables the "have-nots" to become "haves" so that they will be happier and more peaceful.

A continuing decline in world trade will start a trek back to the darkness of the stone age.

MR. BORIN: Mr. Robinson, what is your position on this question?

MR. ROBINSON: Let us get back to the main question, the precise question presented to us: Is world trade the pathway to world peace? I have very serious doubts.

As a political scientist I must recognize other approaches to the attainment of world peace. As an internationalist, I am hoping that a way may be found.

If world peace is used in the political sense—rather than the economic—the subject is somewhat narrowed. Let us agree on that restriction. Can we agree on the meaning of world trade? Free trade? No! Very limited import duties for revenue and regulatory purposes and all other restrictions removed? Perhaps yes.

Who Involved?

Are all countries of the world involved, or just the nation-states outside the Russian orbit? I prefer the former, but we must be practical. If the latter, will removal of restrictions on the states of the West strengthen or weaken them? If strengthened, will they be able to break down in due time the suspicion and distrust of the Soviet Union causing a revival of large-scale Russian trading? Perhaps. If weakened, will they crash as healthy economies and fall prey to the advance of the East, the consumma-

tion so devoutly wished by some high in authority in the Soviet Union? It seems very likely.

What assurance have we that the removal of tariff barriers in protectionist countries like Britain, France and America, will *not* result in lowered standards of living, unemployment, industrial collapse, and economic hardship? Has it not happened to a limited degree in America under the reciprocal trade program where duties have been lowered by the President?

Havana Charter

Is there not a better pathway to world peace? Gentlemen, let us implement the Havana Charter and draw Russia in by cautious operation. Is that hopeless because after two years the Charter has not been ratified? Or let us strengthen the United Nations, our one world organization, and open up trade relations in the name of all, not a few states. Enforce sanction opportunities in the name of organized world opinion. Is the veto barrier insurmountable?

In any case, let us have increased world trade as a part of a program of more frequent contact between peoples—better understanding and better living, but not at the expense of a nation's defensive power and not in the name of material advancement of any power. The former would arouse the anti-capitalist states; the latter would confirm their suspicions. Neither reaction would assure peace.

MR. BORIN: You gentlemen have made your positions in this discussion quite clear, but before we see wherein you agree and disagree, it might be wise to examine the world trade situation today. Kunstenaar, are nations trading more than they did before World War II?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: Well, I think the question which interests us most here—I cannot go into statistics of trade with all the nations—is whether the trade between the world and the United States is larger now than it was before World War II. And if you want me to answer that question, I can say most definitely so. The

average for 1936 to 1948—the yearly average—was 3 billion dollars in exports, and 2½ billion dollars in imports, into the United States. In 1949, the combined figure of exports and imports was four times as high. We exported about 12 billion dollars worth of goods, while we imported about 6 billion dollars worth of goods.

Marshall Plan

MR. BORIN: Isn't it true that part of this trade is artificially stimulated in the Marshall Plan, foreign aid and foreign lending?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I don't think the trade is artificially stimulated in the sense that it is an artificial trade. This trade was very necessary, but because there is such an imbalance between our exports and our imports we had to give foreign nations a means with which they could buy our goods which they have so vitally needed.

MR. BORIN: Will the time come when we will not need artificial stimulation in the form of Marshall Plan or foreign aid of various types?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I think that time may come if we put an end to the barriers which oppose the healthy import program of the United States.

MR. BORIN: In talking about world trade, are we trading with all nations of the world? Can you help us with that, Fisher?

MR. FISHER: You are at the moment, you are even trading with Soviet Russia. In 1949 you actually imported . . .

MR. BORIN: When you say "you" . . .

MR. FISHER: I mean the United States. I keep forgetting I am a Britisher! [Laughter] You did import from Soviet Russia 86 million dollars worth of goods, and you actually exported to Soviet Russia just about 40 millions. I think it was, wasn't it, Kunstenaar?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: That's right.

MR. BORIN: But we are not trading as much as we might with Russia. Is that true?

MR. FISHER: You are not trading as

much as you might like.

MR. BORIN: As much as Russia likes?

MR. ROBINSON: Who knows what Russia likes!

MR. BORIN: What are some of these inhibitors to world trade? We talk about a restricted trade with Russia, and not as much world trade as we would like to have. What are some of the barriers that stand in our way? Can you help us there, Rabbi Binstock?

Iron Curtain

RABBI BINSTOCK: I should say there are a number of barriers. Of course, at the present time there is that Iron Curtain which is discussed so much, which consists, of course, of certain suspicions, antagonisms and fear. There is the impoverishment of various nations that are unable to buy when we should like them to buy. And then there is incapacity of many peoples to produce goods who have the potentiality to produce because they haven't yet obtained the know-how and material and machinery which we, the American people, could supply, and which I hope someday we will supply.

MR. KUNSTENAAR: May I add a few things to the statements of Rabbi Binstock? I think that one of the greatest impediments to healthy expansion of foreign trade is our lack of balancing our exports and imports. As I mentioned before, we are exporting 12 billion dollars worth of goods while we are only importing 6 billion dollars worth of goods. The Marshall Plan aid has to come to an end some day, and what is going to happen then? Either we have to cut down on our exports—and that would be very bad for our own standards of living because hundreds of thousands and even millions of people live from our exports—or then we have to import more, and that is the solution I recognize. I believe we can easily import more, and everybody would profit, because every dollar that we spend on imports comes back into the United States for exports.

MR. BORIN: Mr. Kunstenaar, you seem

very much afraid of a reduced world trade. Why is it important that we keep quite a high level of world trade? What happens when we reduce it to, say, a minimum?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: If we reduce it to a minimum you may be sure that the standard of living is going to go down drastically.

MR. BORIN: How does it happen that we get a reduced standard of living when we reduce world trade?

Result of Reduction

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I can tell you there are many countries that need especially the high industrial products which the United States produces. If they cannot buy them, it is obvious they cannot keep their production up at a level which is necessary for a decent living, and obviously the standard of living is going to go down.

MR. BORIN: When you curtail production, unemployment occurs, and you get a lower standard of living?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: That's correct.

MR. BORIN: All right. Now back to a statement made by Mr. Fisher earlier in the discussion. You spent a number of years in Germany, Mr. Fisher, and you mentioned the fact that in Germany there were tensions created because of restricted trade. Can you tell us a little bit more about that?

MR. FISHER: It is again the question of the eastern zone and the western zone, like I said before was the case in Korea. There is virtually no trade between those two zones, and the main reason for that is the fact that the East mark as opposed to the West mark has far less value. Therefore, if persons in the western zone wish to do business or trade with persons in the eastern zone they have got to try to buy or get the people in the eastern zone to buy their stuff with eastern marks which have about a quarter of the value of the western mark. That is the main idea.

But apart from that there is no contact between the two zones. A western man, if he wants to go to the eastern zone to do business, has to

go through all sorts of most difficult situations to get there. He even has to go through the "green belt" and slip across. He even stands a very good chance of being shot in the process. But the main difficulty is the eastern and western mark.

MR. BORIN: Now, if we could assume for a moment that this barrier were broken down and we could have uninterrupted trade between the two areas, would you see a prosperity in both zones that you don't see now?

MR. FISHER: I think you would.

MR. BORIN: To move back for a moment in our discussion to another statement, Rabbi Binstock said that trade is a sound pathway to world peace. I am wondering just what happens in the process of trading with others that makes for peaceful relations.

RABBI BINSTOCK: I would like, first of all, in reference to Mr. Fisher's statement, to indicate just the opposite has happened in another country before the second world war. Mr. Fisher stated that because there was this barrier between the West and the East zones in Germany the relationships between the two areas were made more difficult. When I had the privilege of visiting Russia before the second world war, in 1931 and 1933 and 1937, I found that because the Russian people had been observing the materials and machines that they obtained from America, that they developed a great respect and admiration for our peoples. Even those two feelings of respect and admiration were leading to friendship, and I believe ultimately might have developed a more peaceful relationship between the two countries.

'Geography He Studied'

I would like to elaborate on that point by reading to you a passage I recently obtained from Carl Sandburg in his *Life of Abraham Lincoln*. In that passage he wrote about Abraham Lincoln: "Geography he studied without knowing he was studying geography. The store had calico prints from

Massachusetts, tea from China, coffee from Brazil, hardware and stoneware from New York and Pennsylvania, products and utensils from the hands and machines of men hundreds and thousands of miles away. The feel of other human zones and a large world to live in, connected with the offered grocery stock with which Abraham Lincoln worked."

And then there is another statement I read some time ago—a very brief one—of Mark Twain. He spoke of traveling—and I would like to substitute the word "trade" for travel. "Travel . . . (or trade) . . . is fatal to prejudice, bigotry and narrow-mindedness, and many of our people need it solely on these grounds. Broad, wholesome, charitable views of men and things cannot be acquired by vegetating in one little corner of the earth all one's lifetime."

MR. BORIN: Up to this point in the discussion, most of what has been said is in support of the proposition that world trade makes for world peace. Mr. Robinson, you said you had very serious doubts about increased trade leading to world peace. Will you develop that position for us?

MR. ROBINSON: I see doubts in two ways: first, if we have that world trade it means the reduction of protective tariffs, especially American protective tariffs . . .

MR. KUNSTENAAR: . . . because we have reciprocal trade agreements.

MR. ROBINSON: But they are reduced, and as a result the standard of living will be reduced.

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I disagree heartily!

U.S. Weakened

MR. ROBINSON: The number of unemployed will increase, factories will be thrown out of operation—and I can quote figures on that so don't disagree too soon!

MR. KUNSTENAAR: Yes, I can quote figures, too!

MR. ROBINSON: Therefore—this is my first point—we would be weakened, and when we are weakened as a great

industrial power we jeopardize our position in face of a possible attack.

The second reason is that world trade—trade between countries—stimulates competition between countries, between companies, between cartels, and that competition can get pretty fierce, and that competition may result, as I think it has in the case of some earlier wars, in the outbreak of hostilities.

'Free Competition'

MR. KUNSTENAAR: Well, let me just take up the last point, Mr. Robinson. I think you will agree that the United States has become a great nation because we have free competition. And I don't think because of all the fierce competition we are having civil wars in this country. It is the same with the world. I do not believe, as a matter of fact I argue against the statement you made, that competition, healthy and decent competition, leads to civil war or general war. Moreover, I also want to disagree heartily with the statement you made that increased trade would weaken us. Increased trade, on the contrary, will strengthen us.

MR. ROBINSON: That's the economic theory, but can you back it up with hard, cold facts?

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I want to tell you I have been for twenty-five years in the foreign trade promotion field, and I am not looking at this academically. I know only one thing: we have to import because there are so many things we need. And also I know that if we give the other nations the possibility to buy from us by providing them with more imports, with more dollars through our imports, we only strengthen our own position.

On the contrary, if we do not do that our position will be weakened.

MR. FISHER: I agree entirely, of course, with Kunstenaar on this subject as you have heard before, Dr. Robinson. He has almost taken the words right out of my mouth.

MR. BORIN: Before we end this discussion I would like to ask the \$64

question here: How can we increase trade with the Russians? Rabbi Binstock, do you have an answer for us?

RABBI BINSTOCK: I would say we can increase trade with the Russians primarily through dissipating the prejudices that we already find existing, and creating avenues of communication and inter-relationship which do not exist. But these things first must be developed before you can increase world trade.

MR. KUNSTENAAR: I agree with Rabbi Binstock on that.

I think we all would like to have more trade with Russia, but there are certain other reasons why we cannot trade with them.

MR. FISHER: I was going to say that

this is about the most difficult question you could possibly ask in this world today.

MR. BORIN: Thank you, gentlemen. It is evident that you agree that commercial intercourse between nations is a vital factor in maintaining world peace. Two of you look at increased trade as the first and most important step in a constructive program pointed toward better relations between nations. We've seen the problems you face in implementing such a program. The dangers in a greatly increased world trade have been pointed out. Other pathways to peace emphasizing political and social reforms have been suggested either as alternative or supplementary proposals.

Have you read these Reviewing Stand transcripts?

Is World Government Possible Now?

Vol. XII, No. 16

Should America Develop the World's Resources?

Vol. XIV, No. 4

Available for 10 cents in coin

A list of more than 100 Reviewing Stand discussions of the past two years is now available free of charge. A postal card to the Reviewing Stand, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois will bring you this list by return mail.



Suggested Readings

Compiled by Helen Perkins,
Reference Department, Deering
Library, Northwestern University



BERGE, W. *Cartels: Challenge to a Free World*. Washington, Harpers, 1937.

CARPENTER, OLIVER CLINTON. *Debate Outlines on Public Questions*. New York, Mail and Express Publishing Company, 1947.

The pros and cons of free trade are given in chapter 24.

EMENY, B. *The Strategy of Raw Materials*. New York, Macmillan Co., 1934.

HOOVER, CALVIN B. *International Trade and Domestic Employment*. New York, McGraw Hill, 1945.

PIGOU, ARTHUR C. *The Economics of Welfare*. London, Macmillan Co., 1920.

SCHATTSCHEIDER, ELMER E. *Politics, Pressures and the Tariff*. New York, Prentice Hall, 1935.

American Academy of Political and Social Science. Annals. p. 148-59, Mr., '50. "Point Four and World Production."

Surveys world production, reviews the goals of the "Point Four" program and the difficulties involved in attempting to carry it out.

American Bar Association Journal 34:1087-91, D., '48. "World Trade: Its Free Establishment Points Way to Peace." S. G. BAGGETT.

The vice-president of the United Fruit Company discusses the problems involved in world trade and shows what was accomplished at the Bogota Conference between the United States and Latin America.

American Federationist 56:6-7+, Ja., '49. "Marshall Plan." I. Brown.

The representative of the American Federation of Labor in Europe outlines the position of organized labor in respect to the Marshall Plan.

Barron's 28:7, O. 4, '48. "ECA Sacrifices Goal to Overt Trade Collapse: New Plan to Spur Europe's Commerce Leaves Bilateral Evils Intact." R. M. BLEIBERG.

Commercial and Financial Chronicle 170:1876-7+, N. 10, '49. "Impressions from a World Tour." W. L. HEMINGWAY.

Notes that the break-up of great empires has led to the worsening of trade advantages and has aroused a fervent nationalism which is causing more restraint on international trade.

Commercial and Financial Chronicle 171:1737+, Ap. 27, '50. "World Trade and a Stable World." H. V. PROCHNOW.

"Midwest banker points out importance of maintaining our international trade and providing means for closing the dollar gap."

Commercial and Financial Chronicle 169:446+, Ja. 27, '49. "The Outlook for World Trade." T. C. BLAISDELL.

The acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce "stresses the importance of sound currencies in developing world trade and sees in the ITO and Marshall Plan a means of breaking down nationalist economic barriers."

Commercial and Financial Chronicle 169:2379+, Je. 2, '49. "The Foundations of World Trade." T. C. BLAISDELL, JR.

The author asserts that a "firm foundation for multilateral and expanded foreign trade is still lacking, and points to disruptions due to war and general political unrest deterring factors."

Commercial and Financial Chronicle 171:1843+, My. 4, '50. "The Role of U.S. Imports in Restoring World Economy." A. M. STRONG.

"Prominent foreign trade specialist recounts postwar derangements in international commerce and outlines chief causes of the current dollar shortage."

Economist 155:446-7, S. 18, '48. "Trade Between East and West."

The need, possibilities and advantages of trade between the East and West.

Harvard Law Review 63:614-42, F., '50. "Sovereign Immunity and Soviet State Trading." B. FENSTERWALD, JR.

Shows how the Soviets change their methods of trading to take advantage of the idiosyncrasies of the laws of various countries. Suggests a modification, therefore, of the doctrine of sovereign immunity.

International Affairs 25:1-7, Ja., '49. "European Recovery Programme in Operation." T. K. FINLETTER.

A discussion of world production and trade with special emphasis on Great Britain.

Journal of Political Economy 57:227-41, Je., '49. "Socialism, Communism and International Trade." B. F. HOSELITZ.

An historical survey and interpretation of Socialist and Marxist thought on the subject of international trade.

New Statesman and Nation 37:548, My. 28, '49. "Two Europes."

The question of the revival of Germany for the facilitation of trade between East and West.

Political Science Quarterly 63:368-82, S., '48. "The Soviet Approach to International Trade." W. C. ARMSTRONG.

An examination of Russia's foreign trade in the light of its domestic economic plans.

United Nations Bulletin 8:190-6, Mr. 1, '50. "Trends in World Trade and Production."

A survey of major economic changes in 1949.



Have You Read These Reviewing Stand Transcripts?

*List of all available Reviewing Stand
discussions on request*

VOLUME XIII

13. Are We Losing the Cold War in Asia?
14. Should the Federal Government Support Farm Prices?
15. Should Prices Go Down Now?
16. Preparing for Atomic Age Problems.
17. Can We Stop Drunken Driving?
18. How Big Should Business Get?
19. Should the President Be Elected By a Direct Vote of the People?
20. What Can Medicine Do for the Aged?
21. What Should the Government Do for the Aged?
22. That Man John L. Lewis.
23. Christianity and Communism.
24. Is Aviation Fulfilling Its Peacetime Role?
25. We Forsee in 1950.
26. Selling Your Ideas on the Job.

VOLUME XIV

1. Is Mercy Killing Justifiable?
2. Can We Stop the Common Cold?
3. What Is America Reading?
4. Should America Develop the World's Resources?
5. The Responsibilities of Business to Society.

6. Should We Educate the Spirit in Our Public Schools?
7. The Problem of Allergy.
8. Is Deficit Spending Sound?
9. The Saar—European Trouble Spot.
10. Should Children Be Spanked?
11. Are We Neglecting the Exceptional Child?
12. Should Gambling Be Legalized?
13. Is A United Church Possible Now?
14. The Fact-Finding Board in Labor Disputes.
15. Do Our Democratic Liberties Depend on Mental Health?
16. Are We Drifting Toward Socialism?
17. How Can We Combat Musical Illiteracy?
18. Do We Want the Welfare State?
19. Natural Versus Synthetic Rubber.
20. Can We Maintain a Bipartisan Foreign Policy?
21. Divorce: An American Tragedy.
22. Can We Control Divorce?
23. What Is Happening to Our War Babies?
24. What Does the Extension of Rent Control Mean?
25. Do We Need a Government Housing Program?

THE REVIEWING STAND
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

I enclose \$1 for a 16-week subscription
 I enclose \$2 for a 32-week subscription
 I enclose \$2.50 for a 52-week subscription
 (Single copies are available at 10 cents each.)

Name

Address

City State